



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.          | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|
| 10/072,399  | 02/05/2002      | Ramkartik Mulukutla  | 020431.1021 4786<br>EXAMINER |                  |
| 5073  | 7590 04/11/2005 |                      |                              |                  |
| BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980 |                 |                      | ALI, MOHAMMAD                |                  |
|   |                 |                      | ART UNIT                     | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |                 |                      | 2167                         |                  |
|   |                 |                      | DATE MAILED: 04/11/2005      |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.                    | Applicant(s)     |  |  |  |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary   | 10/072,399                         | MULUKUTLA ET AL. |  |  |  |
| Lammer-initiated interview daminary  | Examiner                           | Art Unit         |  |  |  |
|  | Mohammad Ali                       | 2167             |  |  |  |
| All Participants:  | Status of Application: <u>Allo</u> | <u>owed</u>      |  |  |  |
| (1) <u>Mohammad Ali</u> .  | (3)                                |                  |  |  |  |
| (2) Eric M. Grabski (Reg. No. 51,749).   | (4)                                |                  |  |  |  |
| Date of Interview: 6/1/05  | Time: <u>2:00pm</u>                |                  |  |  |  |
| Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:   | nt's representative)               |                  |  |  |  |
| Part I.  |                                    |                  |  |  |  |
| Rejection(s) discussed:  |                                    |                  |  |  |  |
|  |                                    |                  |  |  |  |
| Claims discussed:<br>1,2 and 4-35  |                                    |                  |  |  |  |
| Prior art documents discussed:   |                                    |                  |  |  |  |
| Part II.   |                                    |                  |  |  |  |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet   |                                    |                  |  |  |  |
| Part III.  |                                    |                  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul> |                                    |                  |  |  |  |
|  |                                    |                  |  |  |  |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)   |                                    |                  |  |  |  |

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: A telephone was made by the Examiner to Applicant's representative for discussion about the 101 issues to the claims and also, possibilty to allow the case to make Examiner's amendment. The representive agreed about the 101 issues and authorize Examiner to amend the claims to overcome such kinds of deficiency and also amend the claims the way Examiner suggested in order to allow by the Examiner's Amendment. Examiner had used wrong Interview Form. Attorney, Brian Harriss (Reg. No. 48,383) inquiry on April 8, 2005 that do they have to respond the ealier Interview Summary, the Examiner stated that actually they don't have to because it was Examiner Initiated Interview..